



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/655,950

09/04/2003

Michael Gauselmann

ATR-A-123

8895

32566 7590 02/23/2010

PATENT LAW GROUP LLP  
2635 NORTH FIRST STREET  
SUITE 223  
SAN JOSE, CA 95134

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, BINH AN DUC

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3714

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/23/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/655,950	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GAUSELMANN, MICHAEL	
	<b>Examiner</b> Binh-An D. Nguyen	<b>Art Unit</b> 3714	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Dmitry Suhol/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3714

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Nordman in view of Crawford et al. and the reasons of obviousness set forth in the Final Rejection sent December 10, 2009 do teach towards a gaming method and a gaming device as claimed by the Applicant.

Note that, the claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a), NOT under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as indicated by the Applicant.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Nordman teaches a gaming system and method comprising: a first display area (30) for displaying a base game (Fig. 1B), the base game having a plurality of possible outcomes (e.g., slot symbols combinations); and at least one processor for triggering a selection of one or more features to be applied to the base game in response to a triggering event, the one or more features providing a temporary enhancement to the base game, the one or more features acting to increase an award value or increase a player's chances of winning an award when playing the base game (2:45-60; 5:6-6:59); and a second display area (32) for displaying one or more selectors randomly selecting one or more features to be applied to the base game in response to the triggering event (Figs. 1A-5)(2:1-3:40; 7:13-8:22). Nordman further teaches the one or more features include randomly selecting a number of free base game (7:13-21; Fig.4). Nordman does not explicitly teach the one or more features to be applied to at least one subsequent base game; and in response to the triggering event, randomly selecting one or more subsequent base games, to which the one or more features will apply. Crawford et al., however, teaches a gaming system wherein one or more features randomly selected is saved for the next or subsequent game (see abstract). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the user a game symbol saving option, as taught by Crawford et al., to the game system of Nordman to enhance game experience, and further, allow the player to continued the game with the saved game feature to encourage the players to play the game again, thus increase casino revenue.

Further, the Applicant's argument regarding Crawford et al. not teaching the limitation of randomly select the number of games is deemed not to be persuasive. This limitation has been taught by Nordman (7:13-21, Fig.4).

Furthermore, Applicant's argument regarding no randomness involved in the saved symbols of Crawford et al. is deemed not to be persuasive. Crawford teaches that the symbols to be saved are being generated by a random number generator in the program ROM 38 (3:7-10); and that the machine automatically save the symbols to be used in subsequent games 57-64).